

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 19. Accordingly, claims 1-12 and 19-22 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner affirmed its rejections of claims 1-12 and 19-22 as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed May 24, 2006 (the "FOA"). In the FOA, the Examiner rejected: claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki (US 5,841,970) in view of Kippenhan (US 2002/0010769), in further view of Doonan (US 6,807,277), in further view of Hammond (US 2003/078927); claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of Kippenhan, in further view of Doonan, in further view of Hammond, in further view of Takamoto (US 2002/0108060); claims 8-9 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of Doonan, in further view of Hammond; claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of Doonan, in further view of Hammond, in further view of Takamoto; and claims 10-11 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of Doonan, in further view of Hammond, in further view of Dang (US 2003/010113), in further view of Honjo (US 2002/0049912).

A favorable reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is earnestly requested. Specifically, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8 and 19 to provide, generally, communicating, by a wireless device, separately with an authentication server and said database server. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious each and every element of the presently pending independent claims. More specifically, none of the cited references, either alone or in

combination, discloses: (a) a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server; (b) more than one authentication request associated with a mobile station; (c) an authentication server determining whether the mobile station has authority to access a particular database record via a database server; and (d) an authentication server providing two keys to a mobile station so that it can access a database record. As a result, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited references.

First, in light of the foregoing amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server as recited in claim 1. Tabuki discloses a client, an application server and a verification server (Figure 1). The client sends authentication data to the application server (Abstract; Figure 1, "b"; col. 4, lines 10-14), which verifies the authentication data by forwarding the authentication data to a verification server for authentication (Abstract; Figure 1, "c"; col. 4, line 17-22). The client does not communicate directly with the verification server (Figure 1). Contrary to the teachings of Tabuki, the mobile station recited in claim 1 communicates separately with the authentication server and the database server. In other words, commands and requests originating at the mobile station are received at the authentication server of the present invention. In Tabuki, the commands and requests are received at the application server, and the application server communicates with the verification server. The verification server responds to the application server, which, in turn, directs its communications to the client.

The Examiner cited column 6, lines 11-47 for the first authentication request from the mobile station to the authentication server (Office Action page 3, lines 14-17). This interpretation is incorrect because the verification server in Tabuki performs the authentication (col. 4, lines 23-35; col. 6, lines 30-43) and notifies the application server of the result (Abstract; Figure 1, "d"; col. 4, lines 35-37). In fact, Tabuki's stated purpose is to remove authentication responsibility from the application server and perform authentication at the verification server in order to reduce load on the application server (col. 1, lines 40-49). As a result, Tabuki does not disclose, teach or suggest "receiving a first authentication request at an authentication server from a mobile station and

providing a first key from said authentication server to said mobile station in response to said authentication.”

Likewise, none of Tabuki, Kippenhan, Doonan or Hammond disclose, teach nor suggest “providing by said authentication server to said mobile station a second key enabling said mobile station to decrypt said information received from said database server using said second key.” As previously discussed, the client in Tabuki does not communicate directly with the verification server (Figure 1). Contrary to the teachings of Tabuki, Kippenhan, Doonan or Hammond, the authentication server recited in claim 1 communicates separately with the mobile station.

Further, Kippenhan discloses a client-server system that works with the user’s browser to automatically insert stored user data into data fields of a currently displayed web page on the user’s browser to complete a transaction (paragraphs [0031], [0037]). The authentication process described in Kippenhan is no different than the prior art process for which Tabuki is attempting to improve – a server containing the requested data authenticates the user (paragraph [0030]). Doonan discloses a key server that allows a sender to encrypt a message and a recipient to decrypt the encrypted message (Figure 2). Doonan does not disclose a database server or using the key to access data stored on a database server. Hammond discloses a server (Wizard Central) that grants access to other resources on a case-by-case basis (paragraph [0016], Figure 1). Again, the authentication process described in Hammond is no different than the prior art process for which Tabuki is attempting to improve – a server having access to the requested data authenticates the user (paragraph [0016]). Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not disclose a separate authentication server that communicates with the mobile station, terminal or device, to grant access to data on a database server that is accessed directly by the mobile station, terminal or device (authentication server does not act as a portal). Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server as recited in claim 1.

Second, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest more than one authentication request associated with a mobile station. Tabuki only discloses one authentication request. In the FOA, the

Examiner cited column 6, lines 11-47 as disclosing the first authentication request (Office Action page 3, lines 14-17) and column 7, line 38 to column 8, line 27 as disclosing the second authentication request (Office Action page 3, lines 18-30). Applicant, in responding directly to Examiner's argument, stated that Examiner's interpretation is incorrect because both of these portions of Tabuki refer to the same authentication request (compare Figure 1 to Figure 6). In response to Applicant's argument that Examiner's interpretation is incorrect, Examiner has changed (in the Advisory Action) the basis of his conclusion and now cites page 4, lines 10-16 of the FOA for the proposition that Kippenhan teaches the second authentication request. However, this portion of the FOA does not address the number of authentication requests—only the timing of reception of the first key. Kippenhan only discloses one authentication request (paragraphs [0031], [0037]). Neither of Tabuki nor Kippenhan teach multiple authentication requests.

Doonan and Hammond do not cure the deficiencies of Tabuki and Kippenhan. Doonan only discloses one authentication request by the sender (Figure 2). Hammond only discloses one authentication request (paragraph [0016]). Tabuki, Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not disclose more than one authentication request associated with a mobile station. Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest more than one authentication request associated with a mobile station as recited in claim 1. Further, there is no motivation in any of the foregoing references to combine them to obtain multiple authentication requests where there is, in each such reference, a single authentication request.

Third, the Applicant again respectfully submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server determining whether the mobile station has authority to access a particular database record via a database server. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that this argument is outside the claim language, as claim 1 provides, in part: "determining at said authentication server as to whether said mobile station has authority to access said particular database record; and..."

As previously noted, Tabuki merely authenticates a particular application client against an application server and fails to discuss or disclose the “authorization” process regarding a particular database record as currently claimed. In other words, not all data records stored within the database server are accessible by a particular mobile station and nothing in Tabuki discloses this selectively authorization process using the first key as claimed by the present invention. As a result, Tabuki does not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server determining whether the mobile station has authority to access a particular database record via a database server.

Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not cure the deficiencies of Tabuki. Kippenhan only discloses that access to the user's data is granted or denied (paragraphs [0031], [0037]). As previously described, Doonan only discloses a process to encrypt and decrypt messages between a sender and a recipient (Figure 2). Although Hammond discloses categorized access, such access is granted or denied in accordance with a single authentication request and the authentication server acts as the portal to provide the requested information (paragraph [0016]). As recited in claim 1, the present invention requires two authentication requests and the authentication does not act as the portal to provide the requested information. Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server determining whether the mobile station has authority to access a particular database record via a database server as recited in claim 1.

Fourth, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server providing two keys to a mobile station so that it can access a database record. Although Tabuki discloses a verification server that stores a Sys Unique Key, an App. User Key and an Additional App. User Key (FIGURE 4), two of these keys are not provided to the user and subsequently used by the user to access a database record. Tabuki's App. User Key and Additional App. User Key are not provided to the user; instead, they are only used by the verification server to indicate whether the user is eligible to receive services provided by the application server (col. 6, lines 19-23). As a result, Tabuki does not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server providing two keys to a mobile station so that it can access a database record.

Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not cure the deficiencies of Tabuki. Kippenhan only discloses that access to the user's data is granted or denied (paragraphs [0031], [0037]). As previously described, Doonan only discloses a process to encrypt and decrypt messages between a sender and a recipient (Figure 2). Although Hammond discloses categorized access, such access is granted or denied in accordance with a single authentication request and the authentication server acts as the portal to provide the requested information (paragraph [0016]). As recited in claim 1, the present invention requires two authentication requests and the authentication does not act as the portal to provide the requested information. Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest an authentication server determining whether the mobile station has authority to access a particular database record via a database server as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons as provided above, the Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are now patentable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 19

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious each and every element of the presently pending independent claims. More specifically, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses: a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server. As a result, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 19 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited references.

As previously described, and in light of the foregoing amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server as recited in claims 8 and 19. Tabuki discloses a client, an application server and a verification server (Figure 1). The client sends authentication data to the application server (Abstract; Figure 1, "b"; col. 4, lines 10-14), which verifies the authentication data by forwarding the authentication data to a verification server for authentication (Abstract; Figure 1, "c"; col. 4, line 17-22). The client does not communicate directly with the verification server (Figure 1). Contrary to

the teachings of Tabuki, the mobile station recited in claims 8 and 19 communicates separately with the authentication server and the database server.

Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not cure the deficiencies of Tabuki. Kippenhan discloses a client-server system that works with the user's browser to automatically insert stored user data into data fields of a currently displayed web page on the user's browser to complete a transaction (paragraphs [0031], [0037]). The authentication process described in Kippenhan is no different than the prior art process for which Tabuki is attempting to improve – a server containing the requested data authenticates the user (paragraph [0030]). Doonan discloses a key server that allows a sender to encrypt a message and a recipient to decrypt the encrypted message (Figure 2). Doonan does not disclose a database server or using the key to access data stored on a database server. Hammond discloses a server (Wizard Central) that grants access to other resources on a case-by-case basis (paragraph [0016], Figure 1). Again, the authentication process described in Hammond is no different than the prior art process for which Tabuki is attempting to improve – a server having access to the requested data authenticates the user (paragraph [0016]). Kippenhan, Doonan and Hammond do not disclose a separate authentication server that communicates with the user to grant access to data on a database server that is accessed directly by the user (authentication server does not act as a portal).

Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station communicating separately with an authentication server and a database server as recited in claims 8 and 19.

For at least the reasons as provided above, the Applicant submits that independent Claims 8 and 19 and their respective dependent claims are now patentable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-12 and 19-22.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: 8-24-06

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com